

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2-19 and 21-22 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 23 and 24 are added; thus, the pending claims 1, 20, 23 and 24 remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added and accordingly, entry and approval of amended claims 1 and 20 and new claims 23-24 are respectfully requested.

ITEM 5: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CORREA ET AL., EP 1,174,850 (HEREINAFTER CORREA), IN VIEW OF SANO ET AL., U.S. PATENT NO. 6,115,011 (HEREINAFTER SANO).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 20 are amended and claims 23 and 24 are added. Support for the amended claims and the new claims can be found, for example, in FIGS. 8 and 9 and in the specification at, for example, page 16, line 15 to page 17, line 21.

Claim 1, for example, recites in part: "writing an all-cell write discharge in a first subfield having a lightest luminance weight; writing an all-cell write discharge in a second subfield having a second lightest luminance weight; writing, in any subfield including and subsequent to the second subfield, all of the cells to be written in the respective address periods of the plurality of successive display subfields in the display field; and applying sustain pulses to cause light emission in the respective sustain periods of the successive display subfields of the display field."

Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be based upon Correa and Sano, because there is no evidence that one skilled in the art would Modify Correa, Sano or any combination of Correa and Sano to include the claimed "**writing an all-cell write discharge in a first subfield** having a lightest luminance weight; **writing an all-cell write discharge in a second subfield** having a second lightest luminance weight; **writing**, in any subfield **including and subsequent to the second subfield**, all of the cells to be written in the respective address periods of the plurality of successive display subfields in the display field; and applying sustain pulses to cause light emission in the respective sustain periods of the successive display subfields of the display field," as recited in claim 1, because Correa discusses using a self-priming subfield having a soft prime and an address longer than that of a refresh subfield.

One benefit of the embodiment according to claim 1 is, for example, that "0 to 247 gradation levels can be displayed" (see the application specification, at page 16, line 20).

Dependent claims 23 and 24 are patentably distinguishing at least due to their dependence from the independent claims and/or for reciting patentably distinguishing features of their own. Withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 26, 2007

By: 
Matthew H. Polson
Registration No. 58,841

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501